DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 105 SP 014 167

AUTHOR Roseberry, Kent B.
TITLE The Non-Territorial Imperative in a CETE Consortium.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 18p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; Cooperating Teachers; Cooperative Planning; *Field Experience Programs; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Management Systems; Performance Based Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The problems associated with development of a field based teacher education program in the public schools are examined. Conflict between the college education department and the cooperating schools for control of time and curriculum frequently appears in such programs. A model is proposed for the structure and development of a consortium that should significantly reduce traditional disputes and promote growth and communication among these traditionally characteristic adversaries. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177105

108

NOV 23 1977

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kent B. Roseberry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE NON-TERRITORIAL IMPERATIVE IN A CBTE CONSORTIUM

A Journal Manuscript Entry

By: Kent B. Roseberry
Associate Prof. of Secondary Education
120 Poucher Hall
SUNY College at Oswego
Oswego, N. Y. 13126

Phone: (315) 341-4024

SP 014 167

THE NON-TERRITORIAL IMPERATIVE IN A CBTE CONSORTIUM

By Kent B. Roseberry

ABSTRACT

This article examines some of the problems associated with development of new working relationships during the evolution and implementation of a field-centered, CBTE program at the State University of New York College at Oswego, over the last four years.

The New York State Education Department's mandate for field-centered, CBTE programs required the formation of a tri-partite consortium composed of the college, the school(s) and the teacher's bargaining agent. Traditionally, communication among such adversaries as these has at best been poor; at the worst non-existent. The reasons for this lack of communication are varied, but might be most related to the typical tendency among groups of educators to protect their particular "piece of the action," or as suggested in the title, to exhibit the "Territorial Imperative."

The article proposes a model for the structure and development of a consortium, which if implemented with intellectual honesty, should significantly reduce traditional disputes and promote professional growth and communication among these traditionally characteristic adversaries. Such a reduction can lead to the development of a broader professional involvement in the preparation of teachers.

THE NON-TERRITORIAL IMPERATIVE IN A CBTE CONSORTIUM

By Kent B. Roseberry

INTRODUCTION

Robert Ardrey, in his book from which the title of this article is derived, describes a territory as, "...an area of space, whether of water or earth or air, which an animal or group of animals defends as an exclusive preserve. The word is also used to describe the inward compulsion in animate beings to possess and defend such a space."[1] (Emphasis added) It is the latter meaning of possession and defense of a certain area which seems to characterize early attempts at cooperation between collegiate education department staffs and educators in the public sector as they seek to develop a CBTE program.

Some of you may wonder how such an idea as Ardrey proposes relates to Competency-Based Teacher Education efforts. If such is the case, then it is likely that you have not suffered the labor pains associated with giving birth to a cooperatively developed CBTE program. It is the intent of this article to demonstrate how the principle of territoriality interferes with these cooperative efforts and to propose a consortium model which minimizes the expenditure of energy in the defense of territories.

1. Robert Ardrey, The Territorial Imperative, New York, Dell Publishing Co., 1966, p. 4.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

An historical perspective may help to clarify the analogy, at least as it applied to the development of a field-centered, CBTE program for the preparation of Secondary Teachers at the State University of New York College at Oswego. The program's genesis at Oswego occurred in the 1972-73 school year when the Secondary Education Department at the college initiated preliminary dialogue with some of the nearby public school districts. The first manifestations of territoriality occurred at this stage as the college personnel attempted to hold fast to the control of content preparation of prospective teachers, and the public school administrators and teachers told their adversaries what they expected to see in the pre-field preparation of teachers. Neither listened very closely to the other nor relinquished any territory. In time, the college personnel had defined a rather structured program along traditional lines and the public school personnel assumed the usual subservient role in accepting (or would "swallowing" be more appropriate) the suggested program. During this stage of development, the college was sure to defend its territory, if all else failed, by reverting to its legal role in the certification of teachers. Indeed, this role had not been changed by the state mandate for CBTE, but seemed to be an anomaly in light of the expected tripartite consortium arrangement specified in the mandate--the college, the school (both teachers and administrators), and the

bargaining agent for the teachers. To live up to the intent of such a mandate meant that all parties would need to relinquish some of the territorial prerogatives heretofore defended as their exclusive turf.

Be that as it may, the Secondary Education Department managed to wheedle some letters of support for their proposed program from the districts. The proposed program was polished somewhat and then forwarded through the college's governance channels. Enter another territorial dispute having on its side, long-standing tradition--the felt need of academic departments to defend the number of credit hours over which they had control. Indeed, as they clearly let it be known, they had not been consulted and the number of credit hours proposed in education would need to come from their territory. Needless to say, the proposed program was not approved by those august bodies, but instead was referred back to the department for revision.

The first reaction by the department, as it licked its wounds, was to expect that since they had the weight of the state mandate on their side, that they could just wait out the tempest until the deadline became imminent, then resubmit the same program. This "head in the sand" approach did not last long, for some other of the involved parties began to ask questions about consultation. In time the power of rational thought led the Secondary Education Department to reconsideration of its position. Could it be that if

they relinquished some of their traditionally defended territory, the department might gain the desired end--a registered CBTE program? For that purpose a proposal for a Management System was developed which incorporated broad representation from all the parties concerned with the program's design, implementation and monitoring.

DEVELOPMENT OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

The first proposal incorporated large representation from the Secondary Education Department, sufficiently so as to ensure protection of their territory through provision for a voting majority on the main program Steering Committee, as well as on the Campus Coordinating Committee. The proposal did not fare well at the first meeting of representatives of school administrators, college administrators, teachers, department members and the teachers' negotiating agent. Any observer needed only to glance about the room to see that the committee was stacked in favor of the college. Consideration of By-laws for operation of the committee brought this situation into focus, as the question of voting membership was considered. In an attempt to establish their territorial prerogative, the public school personnel recommended that all college members of the Steering Committee serve in an ex officio capacity. Going from majority control of the committee to complete disenfranchisement, seemed incomprehensible, but if the college intended to develop meaningful consultation and cooperation with

the schools, they needed to give due consideration to the school representatives' arguments in favor of the proposal. The ensuing debate clarified many of the old territorial arguments and seemed to show that indeed progress could be made if all parties sacrificed some of their strongly defended territory. Final resolution of the concern occurred through parity representation from the Secondary Education Department by considering it to be on an equal basis with each of the school districts.

Resolution of the question on committee representation as well as other emerging concerns finally led to the development of a working set of By-laws for the structure, operation and governance of the Steering Committee (See Appendix A). These were adopted and the committee began its work in earnest; consideration of a CBTE program which gave due consideration to all involved parties.

The committee recommended that the Secondary Education Department prepare a draft of the proposed program for presentation to the committee at its next meeting, with the stipulation that sufficient copies be available for consideration by their constituencies in each of the schools. The department of Secondary Education supplied the requisite copies and explained them at the next meeting, assuming that the materials would be given a cursory overview followed by approval. But again, the college's territorial rights were tested as the school personnel insisted on reviewing the materials with a proverbial "fine tooth comb." They

read the materials detail by detail and made suggestions for improvement. Much to the surprise of the college members of the committee, the input was valuable and did significantly improve the quality of the program. For the first time in years the various parties were able to openly debate the changes and recommendations in a truly professional atmosphere, treating each other as peers. During these negotiations, it became obvious that the impending deadline for submission would not be met, so in order to maximize the input from all parties, a letter requesting an extension was sent to the appropriate officials. In view of the strength and quality of the cooperative effort, the extension was granted.

To demonstrate its credibility during these phases of program development, the Secondary Education Department made the recommended changes and produced revisions of the documents as quickly as possible. These were to become part of the document submitted to the State Education Department as the proposed CBTE program. No longer was the program an exclusive production of the department; now it had become a truly cooperative development which met the needs of the various constituencies and yet created a minimal amount of territorial disagreement.

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Up to this point we have dealt primarily with a description of the process involved in the development and growth of a

consortium, now it seems appropriate to provide a detailed explanation of the model implemented at Oswego. First, let's look at the objectives for the Management System. These are:

1. To provide a decision-making mechanism which will allow for constant program evolution.
2. To provide continuous program evaluation and feedback so as to ensure that the program is self-correcting.
3. To provide communication links for the sharing of information among all parties involved in the program.

The above objectives were achieved primarily through the program Steering Committee. The functions of that committee are delineated in its charge as follows:

The Steering Committee is to recommend to the Secondary Education Department all necessary changes in the undergraduate training program, approve changes in the program, and otherwise develop policy, rules and regulations which shall govern the operation of the program. The committee shall receive and act upon an annual evaluation of the program and its operation.

This is an ambitious charge, but the committee has functioned at a level above the given charge and developed additional duties and responsibilities. The composition of the committee, as described below, may well have had much to do with its success.

Composition of the Steering Committee	Nos.
*Two (2) members elected from each teaching center	12

Two (2) members elected from Sec. Ed. Dept.	2
EX-OFFICIO MEMBERSHIP (non-voting)	
Sec. Ed. Dept. Chairman	1
Dir. of Field Relationships	1
Dean of Professional Studies (or designee)	1
Representatives of Teacher Ed. Planning Board	2
Director of Program Evaluation	1
TOTAL	20

*To ensure representation of the schools' bargaining agent, these members must present credentials signed by both the president of the individual school's bargaining agent president and also by the chief school administrator for that district. In the case of the representatives from the Secondary Education Dept., their credentials must be signed by the department chairman and indicate that they were elected by a majority of the department members.

Additional committees functioned in the development of the program, but in light of their less influential role, they are only briefly described herein. As a matter of fact, some of the other committees functioned at a very low level and in some cases not at all. Where they functioned, they provided much direction and input in the desigr and implementation of the program. It is expected that over time all of the committees will become functional parts of the Management System.

The first of these subsidiary committees is the Teacher Center Coordinating Committee, one of which functions at some level in each school district which serves as a student teaching (field) center. This committee is to serve primarily as a body to make recommendations to the Steering Committee through its elected representatives, take necessary action on items which relate directly to that center, and serve as a communications feedback board for center planning and evaluation. The committee has representatives from the bargaining agent, district administration, district taxpayers, students from the district high school(s), college student representatives of those student teaching in the district, a program coordinator from the district and the student teaching supervisor from the Secondary Education Dept. who is assigned to that center. A TCCC having this composition provides the broadest possible representation of all constituencies affected by the department's program. In some districts where budget problems had existed, it was difficult to have parents serve on the committee, in that this seemed to produce potential for an adversary relationship. Where a TCCC came close to the recommended membership, it seemed to function at a highly professional level and strengthened relationships between the constituent bodies.

The second subsidiary committee is the On-Campus Coordinating Committee, whose primary function is to take action on items that

are concerned with the on-campus phase of the prospective teacher's preparation. These would include such things as advisement, subject matter competence and other criteria for entry into the program. The OCCC also serves to make recommendations to the Steering Committee. This committee consists of all members of the Secondary Education Department, representatives from academic departments in which prospective teachers have majors, representatives of academic departments in which prospective teachers take required ancillary courses, some education student representatives not presently involved in student teaching, the Secondary Education Dept. Chairman, Dean of Professional Studies (or designee), Dir. of Field Relationships and the Director of Program Evaluation. Through this committee the Secondary Education Department was able to resolve territorial disputes over academic content and gain support and approval for its program on the college campus.

CONCLUSIONS

It should be evident from the foregoing description of activities related to the development, approval and implementation of a field-centered, CBTE program, that territorial disputes can and do arise as soon as new relationships are mandated. Knowing this, you should recognize that it takes imaginative approaches to the formulation of those relationships if cooperative effort and mutual respect is to develop among the variety of professionals taking part in a new program's development. In due time and

through thoughtful negotiation of territorial disputes, mutual respect can develop out of which emerges the common concern for preparation of competent, high quality teachers. Were this to be the only plus for CBTE, then we should still consider it to be more of a boon than a bane and welcome its emergence on our campuses. The implementation of a model for cooperation such as the one described herein, may promote the non-territorial imperative in field-centered CBTE programs and thus facilitate its emergence as an innovation whose time has come.

APPENDIX A

SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAM STEERING COMMITTEE BYLAWS
APPROVED 9/20/76

I. Robert's Rules of Order shall be the authority on all questions of parliamentary procedure not otherwise stated below.

II. The Steering Committee shall meet at least four times during the academic year. One of these meetings shall be held sometime during the last two weeks of May.

III. Voting rights shall be restricted to the official representatives of each center, each representative having one vote. A member must be present in order to vote. The Secondary Education Department shall be considered a prefield center, having two representatives with voting rights.

IV. A quorum shall be defined as 50% of the voting membership.

V. Representatives to the Steering Committee are to be elected for two year staggered terms. Each Center Committee shall designate that one of its current representatives shall serve until May 15, 1977 and the other representative until May 15, 1978. Subsequently, the terms of representatives

shall be for two years commencing May 15 of each year. Representatives may be re-elected an unlimited number of times.

VI. Ex-officio members are non-voting members though they may speak to any of the issues under discussion. Ex-officio members shall be:

Associate Dean of Professional Studies

Chairperson of Secondary Education

Director of Professional Field Relationships

Director of Program Evaluation

Two members of Teacher Education Planning Board

VII. Observers are welcome to attend meetings. At the discretion of the chair they may speak to issues under discussion.

VIII. The chairperson of the Steering Committee shall be elected from among the total membership of the committee. He shall be elected for a two year term, and shall assume the chair at the first meeting following May 15. The term of the current chairperson shall expire May 15, 1978.

IX. The chairperson may vote only to break a tie.

X. The chair shall not constitute the membership of a center, i.e., should a center representative be elected to the

chair, that center shall elect another representative to the ste ring committee.

XI. A recorder shall be elected from among the total membership of a committee. He shall be elected for a two year term and shall assume his duties at the first meeting following May 15.

XII. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the chairperson, the recorder and one member from each of the following: The Secondary Education Department; The Teachers' Association; The Field Center Administrators. Each of the latter three members specified above shall be elected by an at-large vote.

XIII. A vote of 1/3 of those voting members present shall be sufficient to table an item. A motion to table must specify the meeting at which the tabled item shall be discussed.

XIV. The agenda for each meeting and materials related to the agenda shall be forwarded to committee members at least one week prior to the meeting.

XV. These by-laws and any amendments or changes thereto shall require approval of a simple majority of the voting membership.